

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes of October 20, 2006

3. 2006 Spare the Air / Free Transit Campaign Evaluation

Ashley Nguyen and Jack Colbourn presented the results of the 2006 Spare the Air Free/Transit Campaign Evaluation, and MTC's recommendations as well as the Air District's recommendations for the 2007 Program.

Ms. Nguyen stated that the third cycle STP/CMAQ program set aside \$12 million for the Spare the Air/Free Transit program. Roughly \$4.5 million was used for 2006 program leaving a balance of \$7.5 million available for the 2007 program. The decision to program the \$7.5 million towards a fourth Spare the Air campaign program is contingent upon the evaluation results of the 2006 year program.

Jack Colbourn, director of the Outreach and Incentives for the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), presented the plan for 2007, which is to keep the program at three days similar to the 2006 year. Mr. Colbourn addressed comments received from the 2006 Spare the Air program and noted that the Air District will seek corporate sponsorships for the future free transit program.

AC Transit and City of Fairfield representatives expressed concern about the cost effectiveness of the Spare the Air program.

Ms. Nguyen replied that the program evaluation shows that the free transit promotion reduces emissions at the higher levels than most Transportation Control Measures; however, the program cost is an issue of concern.

Jean Roggenkamp, BAAQMD, noted that the cost-effectiveness calculation prepared in the evaluation is different from the TFCA methods. When using the TFCA method, the cost-effectiveness of the free transit campaign is considerably better.

Tom Margro, BART, expressed concern about repeating the free all day program because of the damage and disturbances experienced on the BART system in the early afternoon. Mr. Margro suggested that free transit only occur in the mornings for BART.

Mike Scanlon, Caltrain/Samtrans, stated that Caltrain had a few problems similar to BART, but less pronounced.

Alan Zahradnik, Golden Gate Bridge and Highway Transportation District, was pleased that the 2006 Spare the Air report acknowledged the issues that the Golden Gate ferry had due to the overcrowding of ferries.

Steve Heminger, MTC, stated that if Spare the Air days were brought back to mornings only the ridership would decrease and suggested that a middle ground should be explored.

Jose Luis Moscovich, SFCTA, observed that the Partnership has an obligation to continue to raise awareness of public transportation and suggested keeping the program until alternatives are identified.

Jack Broadbent, BAAQMD, believes that the program is successful and relatively new and should be continued as a part of the overall foundation of improving air quality in the Bay Area.

Dennis Fay, Alameda County CMA, agreed with Mr. Broadbent stating that the 2006 Campaign was the first program to offer free, all day, transit and it is too early to cut the program off before improving it.

Bob McCleary, Contra Costa Transportation Authority, stated that BART, ferries, and Caltrain are in a different class with larger fares and longer trips and free mornings only for those systems should be considered and that it would still be consistent with the overall goals of the program. Mr. McCleary added that if there was an advance notice of when a Spare the Air day would occur that ridership might grow.

A general consensus was met stating that the program should be given another year, with a closer eye on its cost effectiveness. In addition, issues raised by the ferries, BART, and Caltrain should be addressed by evaluating morning only free commutes for these systems on Spare the Air days.

4. MTC Environmental Justice Principles

Suzanne Smith, Sonoma County Transportation Authority, provided feedback from the Environmental Justice committee. Ms. Smith stated that after a number of meetings to review and evaluate historical funding actions, no clear definition of funding inequity was reached.

Ms. Smith added that MTC did an extraordinary job pulling together data, but the Environmental Justice committee is aware that there are limitations to data availability. Going forward, MTC may need to alter its data collection to better answer questions about funding distribution, especially for funds over which MTC has no discretion.

Mr. Margro, observed that there were some issues with the data presented.

Rich Napier, City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo, urged the Partnership not to confuse the issue of inequity versus distribution between transit operators.

Mr. Moscovich, found it difficult to believe that as a region a pattern of inequity was not found and wants a better explanation of inequities.

Mr. McCleary, commended MTC staff and those who served on the Environmental Justice committee and stated that data can always be argued and that there is no way to fully reflect the

complexity of transit financing in the Bay Area or the different levels of funding to support the different operators. Mr. McCleary believes that MTC should not be creating an entitlement or sense of entitlement because the Partnership will never agree on whether or not there are inequities between operators.

Daryl Halls, Solano Transportation Authority, stated that the small operators met with Mr. Heminger because MTC was trying to get a better handle on small operators' capital and operating needs. Mr. Halls stated that inequity is throughout the region and not just an urban issue. As the suburban counties are growing and maturing small operators also have viable trends.

George Fink, City of Fairfield, stated that MTC did an excellent job collecting as far back as they could, but asked why the Partnership should recommend the item if no one can agree.

Mona Babauta, Santa Rosa City Bus, shares Mr. McCleary's concerns about scenario #3, but also has concerns about scenario #1 and its relation to STA funding in which all of the STA funding in Santa Rosa is spent on the minority and disabled community. Ms Babauta, stated that any shift of funding or state funding would impact the county's ability to provide the current level of service to that community. In addition, Ms. Babauta stated that the City Bus appreciates the fact that there are some inequities in the urban areas served by the five larger operators, but those operators serve really dense population areas. Any shift of funding based on percentage of minority and low-income populations to the larger urbanized areas would impact just general operations in the smaller urbanized areas and the small North Bay operators.

Mr. Moscovich, stated that the report is a good effort but it is inconclusive and therefore the Partnership cannot make a decision without understanding the data better.

Mary King, AC Transit, felt the issue was becoming counterproductive because there is no clear definition of equity/inequity..

Ms. Smith, stated that there was clearly no consensus from the Partnership, but asked the Partnership if there was a statement that can be made and submitted to the Commission.

Mr. Napier, made a motion that the Partnership advocate for increased funding for transit operations and transit capital as a statement to go to the Commission.

In conclusion, the Partnership supports Principles #1 and #2, but not #3 and #4 because a consensus of inequities could not be reached.

James Corless, MTC, stated that after Partnership Board, the item would go to Minority Citizens Advisory Council (MCAC) on December 12th and the Legislation Committee on January 12th for additional comments.

5. Proposition 1B – Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) Draft Regional Priorities

Alix Bockelman, MTC, provided background on the CMIA list of projects, which is a \$4.5 billion statewide competitive program for improving the state highways. The focus of which is providing congestion relief on the most highly congested corridors in the state as well as improving connectivity and safety.

Albert Yee, MTC, provided background on the other funding options included in the Proposition 1B program that could complement CMIA. Mr. Yee also added that all CMIA projects must be able to commence construction by December 31st, 2012. There is a 40% north/60% south split for the CMIA funding. The maximum that Northern California will be getting is \$1.8 billion and the Bay Area should advocate for at least 85% of that allocation based on its congestion share.

John Barna, CTC, announced that CTC held a session on December 1st in Sacramento. Mr. Barna stated that he is trying to be available to answer questions on the nomination process and the review of projects. Mr. Barna commended MTC staff for taking initiative and everyone who participated on a fast time frame.

Mr. Barna observed that the transportation community is demonstrating to the legislature and the voters that they are willing and able to move quickly to implement Proposition 1B, especially the CMIA portion, which sets the tone for the remainder Proposition 1B.

Ian Mcavoy, San Mateo County Transportation District, asked what is the criteria for considering projects for Caltrans' proposed project list. Bijan Sartipi, Caltrans, stated that there are factors that need to be considered as was discussed by Mr. Barna, and MTC staff such as congestion, connectivity, and safety issues. In addition, Mr. Sartipi stated that the CAL B/C ratio is one of the measures that will be used to identify the best return on investment for transportation.

Mr. Barna added that CAL B/C has a lot variables and it is not the only thing the CTC will evaluate.

Mr. Napier commended MTC for recognizing the importance of system management and stated that the CAL B/C ratios are high for these projects because they tend to be less costly but quite effective. Mr. Barna replied that there is an important role for system management projects in the CMIA.

Ms. Smith asked Bijan to comment on Caltrans' draft list.

Mr. Sartipi stated that Caltrans' proposed list for the Bay Area is very similar to MTC's list because Caltrans worked closely with MTC as well as other transportation officials. Caltrans will share their list either after the Partnership Board meeting or the following week.

Several CMA Directors provided project specific support for projects included in the MTC CMIA list and urged CTC's consideration. There was also a question about how a project would be treated if it was on the MTC list but not on the Caltrans list or vice versa.

David Schonbrunn, a member of the public, commented on the compatibility of the CMIA program with the state's greenhouse gas reduction goals because the expected program result will be a significant increase in VMT and greenhouse emissions.

Mr. Barna stated that the CMIA projects need to be in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and that the RTP reflects local decision making about land use and include projects that have been included in the air quality conformity process for the Bay Area. CTC has yet to see criteria for AB 32 that would be compatible with transportation programming. When the California Air Resources Board has ideas on how AB 32 should be implemented, the CTC will be a part of the process, but for the CMIA program it is premature.

Ms. Bockelman stated that comments from the Partnership will be presented to the Programming and Allocation Committee on Wednesday, December 13th and to MTC Commission on December 20th at which time the Commission will be asked to release the proposed CMIA list of projects for comment until January 5th. There will be a special Commission meeting on January 10th to approve a recommended list that will be sent to the CTC on January 16th.

6. Other

No comments.

7. Adjourn for Next Meeting